UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA HAMMOND DIVISION

JAMES A. PIGGEE, individually, and as)	
an officer of G.E.M.S., Inc., and DOES)	
1-149, yet unidentified African Americans)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	2:08-CV-107-PPS-PRC
)	
COLUMBIA SUSSEX CORP.,)	
COLUMBIA PROPERTIES BATON)	
ROUGE, LTD., d/b/a/ Baton Rouge)	
Marriott,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Paul Cherry regarding Defendants' motion for sanctions and contempt for Plaintiffs' failure to comply with the Court's July 7, 2010 discovery order [DE 64]. Magistrate Judge Cherry entered his Report and Recommendation on August 10, 2010 [Id.]. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the parties had fourteen days after being served with a copy of the Report and Recommendation to file written objections. That deadline has passed, and no parties have objected to the Report and Recommendation.

The Court, having reviewed the Report and Recommendation, agrees with the reasoning therein and finds that the sanctions recommended by Judge Cherry pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(C) and 37(d)(3) are appropriate in this case.

Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation [DE 64] in its entirety and incorporates all of its findings and recommendations into this order. Defendants' motion for contempt and sanctions is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part [DE 57].

Specifically, the Court **DENIES** Defendants' request for sanctions in the form of dismissal with

prejudice. The Court, however, **GRANTS** Defendants' request for the reasonable expenses,

including attorneys' fees, that Defendants incurred in preparing the filings described in the

Report and Recommendation—namely, (1) the June 16, 2010 motion to compel [DE 51]; (2) the

July 2, 2010 reply in support of the motion to compel [DE 53]; (3) the July 20, 2010 motion for

sanctions [DE 57]; and (4) the July 28, 2010 response in opposition to the second motion for

extension of time [DE 61].

Because the Court finds that Defendants are entitled to the foregoing expenses, the

Defendants shall **FILE** bills of cost, as contemplated by Fed. R. Civ. P. 37, for those expenses.

The Defendants' bills of cost are due by **September 16, 2010**. Plaintiffs must file any objections

to the bills of cost by **September 30, 2010.**

SO ORDERED.

ENTERED: August 31, 2010

/s/ Philip P. Simon

PHILIP P. SIMON, CHIEF JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2